UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,874	10/09/2003	Yung Chang Liang	TRNDP012	7893

22434 7590 08/22/2007

BEYER WEAVER LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER	
DEBNATH, SUMAN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2135	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
08/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/683,874	LIANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suman Debnath	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,5,8-11,14,15 and 18-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-5,8-11,14-15 and 18-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/02/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-5, 8-11, 14-15 and 18-21 are pending in this application.

2. Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14-15, 18 and 20 are presently amended.

3. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 12-13 and 16-17 are cancelled.

4. Claim 21 has been newly presented in the amendment filed 01 June 2007.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 5 and 15 are objected to for lack of antecedent basis:

Claim 5 recites "the newly connected client devices" in line 6 and "the visitor client" in line 8.

Claim 15 recites "the visitor client" in line 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1, 4-5, 8-11, 14-15 and 18-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanovsky (Patent No.: US 7,010,807 B1) and further in view of Suorsa et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0156894 A1) (hereinafter "Suorsa") and Herrmann et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0055994 A1) (hereinafter "Herrmann").

8. As to claim 1, Yanovsky discloses in a distributed network having a number of server computers and associated client devices, method of enforcing an anti-virus security policy (abstract), comprising:

updating a virus monitor with current rules and policies in an operating procedures and policy file received from a controller (col. 3, lines 55-65, "..enforces and maintains the anti-virus policy");

querying each of the client devices to determine if each of the client devices has an appropriate anti-virus software installed (col. 4, lines 25-30 and lines 59-63);

identifying those queried client devices not having the appropriate anti-virus software as target client devices (col. 4, lines 35-40 and 63-67, "....checks the version number against the current version number");

installing the appropriate anti-virus software to all target client devices (col. 4, lines 40-45 and col. 5, lines 5-11);

scanning the visitor client device using a virus scan Server module (col. 4, lines 25-45 and 52-67); and

Yanovsky doesn't explicitly disclose locking all communication channels of the target client devices to an anti- virus software installation server; when a visitor client device is connected to the network, looking all communication channels of the visitor client device to the anti-virus software, installation server; granting a temporary credential use by the visitor client device when it is determined that the visitor client device is free of viruses and has other anti-virus software or has the appropriate anti-virus software.

However, Suorsa discloses locking all communication channels of the target client devices to an anti- virus software installation server ([0009], [0070], Suorsa teaches the concept of locking all communication channels by implementing locking signal); when a visitor client device is connected to the network, looking all communication channels of the visitor client device to the anti-virus software, installation server ([0009], [0070], Suorsa teaches the concept of locking all communication channels by implementing locking signal, see also [0014], "remote agents");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky as taught by Suorsa in order to "ensure that the agents are not overburdened (Suorsa, [0070])." Furthermore, one would be motivated to do so to make the installation faster.

Neither Yanovsky nor Suorsa explicitly disclose granting a temporary credential use by the visitor client device when it is determined that the visitor client device is free of viruses and has other anti-virus software or has the appropriate anti-virus software.

However, Herrmann discloses granting a temporary credential use by the visitor client device when it is determined that the visitor client device is free of viruses and has other anti-virus software or has the appropriate anti-virus software ([0075], [0077], "session").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky and Suorsa as taught by Hermann in order to "ensure that all machines connected to a server or a network, including client computers that are joining (e.g. remotely connecting to) a

network, are using specified anti-virus products to protect against infiltration by viruses (Herrmann, [0014])."

9. As to claim 11, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

10. As to claims 4 and 14, Yanovsky discloses further comprising:

posting a notification that the target client devices are prevented from communicating with other systems in the network until such time as the appropriate anti-virus software has been installed therein (col. 3, lines 60-67 and col. 4, lines 35-45, which describes denying access for any host devices that fails to meet the policy and grant access after installation of software).

Yanovsky doesn't explicitly disclose visitor client devices. However, Suorsa discloses visitor client devices ([0014], "remote agents").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky as taught by Suorsa in order to provide support to the external client with software component updates.

11. As to claims 5 and 15, Yanovsky discloses further comprising:

once the appropriate anti-virus software has been installed in the target client devices or the visitor client, can communicate with the other devices of network (col. 4,

lines 60-67 and col. 5, lines 1-21, which describes granting access to the host devices after updating the host devices with current version of software components).

Yanovsky doesn't explicitly disclose relinquishing the lock on the communication channels for the newly connected client devices and the target client devices. However, Suorsa discloses relinquishing the lock on the communication channels for the newly connected client devices and the target client devices (e.g., claim 11 and [0014], [0070]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky as taught by Suorsa in order to free up the resources.

12. As to claims 8 and 18, neither Yanovsky nor Suorsa explicitly disclose further comprising:

periodically determining validity of the credential; and

granting a new credential only if the visitor client device has not been infected by a computer virus.

However, Hermann discloses further comprising:

periodically determining validity of the credential ("...subsequently reevaluate the decision to permit access", e.g., [0077]); and

granting a new credential only if the visitor client device has not been infected by a computer virus ([0075], [0077], "session").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky and Suorsa as taught by Herrmann in order to maintain the integrity of access control of network devices.

13. As to claims 9 and 19, neither Yanovsky nor Suorsa explicitly disclose further comprising: invalidating the credential when it is determined to not be valid.

However, Herrmann discloses invalidating the credential when it is determined to not be valid ([0077], e.g., "session", "restrict one or more client devices").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky and Suorsa as taught by Herrmann in order to maintain the integrity of access control of network devices.

14. As to claims 10 and 20, neither Yanovsky nor Suorsa explicitly discloses wherein the credential is not valid after a period of time as determined by the granting. However, Herrmann discloses a method wherein the credential is not valid after a period of time as determined by the granting ("...a defined frequency interval", e.g., [0077]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Yanovsky and Suorsa as taught by Herrmann in order to maintain the integrity of access control of network devices.

15. As to claim 21, Yanovsky discloses determining whether a transmission protocol to communicate data in the network utilizes encryption and not locking all communication channels if encryption is used (col. 4, lines 10-17).

16. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Response to Amendment

17. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14-15, 18 and 20, which necessitated new ground of rejections. See rejection above.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suman Debnath whose telephone number is 571 270 1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100